DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 261 CG 009 552

AUTHOR Taylor, Donald L.
TITLE Sufficiency, Intimacy and the Good Life.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Behavior; *Counseling; Interpersonal Problems; *Interpersonal Relationship; Objectives; *Self Actualization; Social Change; State of the Art Reviews; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Intimacy

ABSTRACT

Our capacity to provide food and shelter is freeing us from the constant burden of keeping the wolf away from the door. We are increasingly able to give our attention to other values. This type of sufficiency provides time and circumstances for developing intimate relationships. Intimate relationships are characterized by revelation of one's innermost thoughts and feelings as well as one's physical body. The development of intimate relationships is creating new kinds of problems. For example, the shock caused be expressing previously unstated feelings to a spouse may lead to separation. The unexpected but honest answers of children create conflict between generations. Intimacy also provides opportunities for new kinds of experiences which can intensify and deepen relationships. Counselors and educators need to adjust their concerns and assumptions to the reality of the new sufficiency. Sacrifice and thankfulness, traditional virtues, are becoming obsolescent in family decisions whereas contentment and joy are being adopted as realistic goals. (Author)

ED101261

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sufficiency, Intimacy and The Good Life

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Donald L. Taylor
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville
Edwardsville, Illinois 62025

CG 009 552

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Our capacity to provide food and shelter is freeing us from the constant burden of keeping the wolf away from the door. Free time is increasing as the work week shrinks. Serious effort is being made to institute a guaranteed minimum income for all families. The future can bring even more affluency. Harvey Wheeler, Senior Fellow at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, predicts that by "the year 2000 the manufacturing of products will require about ten percent of the available labor force."

Parallel with the increase in free time and worldly goods is a developing interest in intimacy, which is being characterized as revelation of one's innermost thoughts and feelings as well as one's physical body. When confronted with more time for themselves, men and women very often comment, "At last I have some time to spend with my family. I am going to enjoy getting better acquainted with them."

The above two variables--sufficiency and intimacy--are profoundly influencing our relationship living. Sufficiency is changing our value system and enhancing the development of new feelings. Acts of intimacy bring into our relationships these new values and feelings. As a result, we face new kinds of problems which need to be resolved if we are to benefit from the implied Utopia of sufficiency and intimacy.

Conflict is the essence of many of these problems--conflict between two different life styles. At one end of the continuum is a group of values and feelings developed and fostered by a life style concerned with scarcity. This is our traditional life style. It is concerned with the distribution of scarce goods. Individuals and groups assume that if they

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

take what they want, someone else will be deprived. They value sacrifice, selflessness, altruism, thankfulness, and hard work. The Golden Rule exemplifies this valued system. The loving family is characterized as putting each other first.

At the other end of the continuum, we find a developing life style which emphasizes self-fulfillment. Selfishness is not considered an unpardonable sin. There is an emphasis on Being as much as or more than on Doing. Individuals seek Joy and Contentment. Love is interpreted as acceptance and understanding rather than "doing for" someone and possessing. A loving family is characterized as a group of individuals who give and share without expecting something in return.

Some of the simpler problems (created by this conflict of value systems) arise between parents and children. A typical problem is the stress created in families over the issue of thankfulness. Traditional parents teach their children to be thankful for gifts, favors and other considerations received. When a child fails to express thanks, a parent prompts the child with the question, "What do you say?" The prompting usually triggers a response of "Thank you."

However, during moments of intimacy when unrevealed feelings are being expressed, a child or even a grown-up may confess he really doesn't feel thankful. This admission to others or even to oneself can create difficulties. In response to such confessions, parents tell their children or themselves that they should feel thankful and believe there is something wrong with a person lacking in thankfulness. Such people are branded as ungrateful.

The experiences of the new sufficiency world explain why individuals do not necessarily feel thankful upon receipt of a gift. If the act of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

giving doesn't involve sacrifice or extra effort, a receiver is not likely to feel thankful. As one thoughtful child explained, "Sure my Dad gives me plenty of money. But he's got plenty to give. Whether or not he gives me twenty dollars or not doesn't influence his living in the least. Giving me money requires no sacrifice, no effort on his part. Furthermore, I'm not so strapped for money that I'm going to suffer if he doesn't give me anything. Of course I don't feel thankful. Why should I?"

Many parents find it difficult to understand and to accept this attitude. They judge responses to receiving in terms of a world in which the factor of scarcity was a dominant consideration. Even a five dollar gift usually involved a giving up and going without on somebody else's part. Such knowledge is conducive to provoking grateful feelings and it is understandable how parents feel.

Attempts by parents to create feelings of thankfulness are going to fail unless scarcity is a factor in the relationship. Admonishment only creates angry parents and confused children. The best a child can do to create harmony is to pretend he is thankful. The only genuine feeling is often that of sorrow and regret. As one son explained to his Dad, "I am truly sorry I wasn't brought up during the Depression. Maybe I could be thankful in your way for such so-called luxuries as cars and vacations I take for granted."

The problem of thankfulness is also causing stress and strain between husbands and wives. Traditional husbands expect a thankful attitude from their wives. A major weapon during a fight is the declaration, "After all I have done for you, you can at least be thankful." Modern wives don't see their husbands' efforts as acts of sacrifice and selflessness. Their reactions sound like this, "What is yours is also mine. There's

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enough for both so why this big act of being noble and overworked for my sake? If I have to, I can get what I want through my own efforts."

Conflicts such as we have just mentioned can be resolved through cooperation, compromise and respect for each other. However, there is a more basic problem. It is the need for everyone to adjust to a world which is fundamentally different from the one most of us have experienced. It is a world premised on sufficiency and possible abundance instead of scarcity. This means that many values will have to be rearranged in terms of importance, some traditional values will have to be discarded and some new ones will have to be developed.

The need for rearrangement of value priorities can be illustrated with a discussion of the importance of trust and love in a relationship. Under the traditional life style both love and trust are highly valued, but trust is more important than love. Custom has sharply divided the activities of men, women and children. Their work worlds have been very segregated as have been their social worlds. The practice for men at social gatherings to leave the women and talk "men's talk" symbolizes the separate social worlds. There is also the practice of men travelling without their wives. Salesmen leave to sell their merchandise and professors attend conventions to discuss intellectual issues.

The importance of trust under such circumstances is rather obvious. It becomes the only substitute for the pressures of the local community. Trust becomes synonymous with a good relationship. Good marriages have been reflected in such statements as, "I can trust him any place, with anyone." The importance of trust in the relationship has also been reflected in the dire consequences of breaking a trust. There follows

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a common sense conclusion, that if you can't trust a person, it is impossible to live with him.

For any number of reasons the social barriers between sexes and a variety of other grouping is breaking down. Many families are now wealthy enough that both husband and wife can travel together. There is also as much reason for women to travel as for the men.

Of particular significance to this paper is the role of intimacy in breaking down the barriers. It is the antithesis of separateness and secrecy. Open marriage represents the new model. An individual involved in an intimate and loving relationship doesn't have to trust a spouse, because she is going to know how he feels and what he does.

The crucial question becomes the response to the knowing. It is at this point that love as a value becomes most significant. This imagined conversation illustrates the proposition.

Wife, "I must tell you about my trip to the convention. I met the most loving man. He escorted me to the most fabulous eating places. He is a great conversationalist and has great ideas."

Husband, "Did you spend any time in his room?"

Wife "I want to share those experiences with you too. But I am somewhat reluctant to say anything since you've been getting up tight when I tell you about the other men in my life--even when sex isn't involved. As you can surmise, the answer to your question is yes."

The husband's answer can vary drastically depending whether trust or love is the dominant factor in the relationship. The traditional response is well known. "Yeah, I am more than a little disgusted with your "messing around." Each time I trust you to refrain, you violate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the trust again. If you can't trust someone, how can you live with her? I am ready to pull out. You can get the divorce if you want it that way."

A loving spouse in contrast to a trusting spouse will emphasize understanding and acceptance. The answer reflects such attitudes as, "I understand how you feel. I know your attitude and I don't think you're going to change. The fact I can't accept wholeheartedly is the problem I have to work with. I do love you enough to understand your life style and I am confident I will soon be able to accept you as you are. I may be able to grow enough to enjoy sharing your fun moments with other men."

The emphasis on love doesn't eliminate the value of trust in a relationship but it does modify its impact. For one thing, the use of trust will be more limited. It will also center around agreements mutually concluded. At the same time, the need for agreements on restrictions will be more limited. A loving relationship offers freedom to individuals in a relationship and more personal responsibility to judge the effects of particular behavior and attitudes on a day-to-day basis. Promises are not intended to last forever.

As values are being rearranged in terms of priorities, some of our traditional values will have to be discarded. The Golden Rule, for example, is becoming dated as sufficiency increases. Most people will find out they can do for themselves. They no longer play the game of giving in hopes of getting what they want. Many of the games organized around the Golden Rule principle "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" will have to be eliminated. The basic game we have named the Selfishness game.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It developed in response to the need for curbing desires to take what we want when we want it. It is a game designed to get what you want without taking. A more sophisticated form of play insists you get what you want without even asking for it. If you are successful, you get what you want without being censured for putting your welfare ahead of others.

The basic selfishness game is a relatively simple one. It usually involves two people, such as husband and wife, but can include several more. The plan has one main strategy. You agree to give me what I want and I will give you what you want. Kevin and Caroline illustrate how it works. First listen to Caroline, "Kevin is such a wonderful husband. There is not a day he doesn't try to please me. He can almost read my mind. I wish for something, and there he is, trying to get it for me. If I need a new dress, he suggests we go shopping. If I want to spend an extra dollar, he tries to find the money somewhere. He is truly a kind and generous husband."

Kevin praises Caroline in the same manner. "It's amazing how little I have to think about myself. She is one of those women who knows how to make a husband happy. I think it's the little things I appreciate the most; keeping the kids off my back, good food, running errands and above all, no nagging."

Many couples have successfully played the game, both players receiving what they want (the degree of satisfaction is, of course, tied to the income of the couple). Most significant is the fact they seemed to be getting what they want without seeming selfish. They didn't have to selfishly take, they didn't even have to ask. As an added bonus, they are used as examples of happily married couples.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Let's examine this game in terms of the intimacy factor. It does have a particular type of intimacy associated with it. When there isn't enough to go around, there is a common concern that every member of the family receives his fair share. Second, because no one is allowed to speak for himself, there is a need for each member of the family to put himself in the place of the others. Each member is supposed to divine in some manner what other members want and need. In order to facilitate this goal, members of the family consult with each other. There are shared secrets with everyone but the one in need. The secret intrigues at Christmas time are examples, par excellence, of intimacy based on scarcity.

Another feature of the game--the built-in dependency upon each other--also influences the nature of the intimacies. Dependency forces concern for others because how the others feel vitally influences and even determines one's own welfare. When someone asks, "How do you feel today?", there could be genuine concern for the other person but there is also the major concern of how that person's mood will affect you. If the other person is in a happy state, you are more likely to get his needed concern. Both individuals could be happy because each was happy. If one were frustrated, neither could rejoice.

This type of sharing easily generates the feeling, "We're all in this together." It's realistic in many families to say, "If Dad isn't happy, none of us will be happy." Making Dad happy or overcoming other obstacles becomes a group job which creates opportunities for revealing to each other in the group how you feel.

Feelings generated by overcoming are well known in scarcity circumstances. They are highly valued and sought after. Thankfulness has

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

already been mentioned. Others are appreciation, consideration of others and caring. If scarcity is especially acute, groups feel good when they share hunger, frustration, sacrifice, failure and fear. Adversity has long been recognized as a means for bringing people together. They feel like one. They are intimate.

It's not difficult to observe what happens to the intimacy of scarcity and dependency when one's existence is no longer threatened. The changing circumstances are reflected in such remarks as these, "I don't know what is happening to our family. We just don't pull together anymore. I suggested we clean the yard together and believe me, it took a long time to find this kind of project. What happened? Our oldest son hired the kid next door to do his part. He said he had to preside over a school meeting. Since he had his own money, there wasn't much I could do about it. I've learned I am not to manage his earnings."

Another mother expressed her concern for her family, "The holidays aren't the fun they used to be. Christmas is becoming a drag. It's becoming difficult to buy presents because it's Christmas around here everyday. Then the kids are so blasé about it all. No squealing or yelling when they open their presents. If they don't get what they want, they tell you so. I'll be honest, I am not going to knock myself out for them any more."

One part of a student's paper on family closeness made this observation, "The closest we've been in a long time was when we tried to figure out what we could do together. We really tried to come up with something. We all realized we should be a close family. We all felt sorry and guilty as each admitted we weren't that close. We all felt terrible and when

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mom cried, we cried too. Now we know how each other feels but we still don't have anything to do together."

Even though there are built-in circumstances which enhance the development of intimacy, the selfishness game is essentially an anti-intimacy life style. For one thing, the possibilities for exploitation put limits on self-revelation. Outside a very limited circle of friends, one is cautioned not to reveal too much. One even runs the risk of being victimized by those closest to you. The Saint game, a variation of the selfishness game, is designed to manipulate and control others. It is the game that is the hardest for most people to identify, simply because the role of the Saint is a valid one in our society. As long as our world holds injustice, poverty and inequality, we will need those people among us who place their concern for others before their own. Whether called by God or by their own consciences, they will practice medicine among the poor, work for equal rights of others, or even sacrifice their lives for a cause they feel is just. And they should receive the respect and help of those who see the necessity of such work.

However, there are those who assume the role of the Saint but who do not embody its principle--that the work performed must be for the benefit of others as they see it, with absolutely no conditions or wishes imposed by the giver. There can be no halfway Saint, who says, "I'll do this for the poor and get a little something out of it myself," or "I'll give you help if you'll just stop acting the way you do." Once he imposes his own desires or values on an interaction, the man who performs as a Saint becomes merely another player of games.

Established institutional roles often harbor the Saint-player. The overbearing minister and dictating social worker fit into this pattern. Even the loving father can slip into this game. For example,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Grande had very definite ideas about the role of women. They were to be pure, clean, and above reproach and were to serve as examples for children. His wife and daughters were under tremendous pressures from him to be "lady-like." Their dress was always modest. The daughters were not allowed to call boys. Particularly annoying to Mr. Grande was the habit of women crossing their legs.

As long as his women acted as women should, he was very generous with them. He was generous with money for the right kind of dresses even if it meant he couldn't buy the clothes he wanted. He would stay at home so they could attend cultural events. He was sincere when he said, "There is nothing I won't do for my women."

The women felt trapped because of Mr. Grande's personal sacrifices. He was generous, patient, kind and "everything you could expect from a considerate husband and father." Yet they really didn't believe he had their welfare in mind at all.

The situation built up and exploded one evening when their youngest daughter decided on an encounter. She purposely crossed her legs and was called for it by her father. In a dejected manner he said, "After all I have done for you, why can't you respect my right to have decent women around me? I've sacrificed enough and I still don't have the respect of any of you. I'm going out and kill myself. Maybe my death will shock you into decency."

Mr. Grande's daughter, Rachel, defended herself. She actually challenged him to commit suicide. "Dad, if you are willing to die for your principles, go ahead. But please realize, I will have no sense of guilt or shame if you commit such a terrible act. You can do what you want with your life; I want the right to be responsible for myself. Thanks for the many wonderful opportunities and gifts, but please don't

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

expect obedience and self-sacrifice in return. Frankly, I think you could become a truly generous person if you would do a bit more for yourself."

The past two games employ strategies based on giving in order to get. Another game that must be discarded is another form of the selfishness game which works on the premise of getting without really giving. It is a game which prevents the development of intimacy in a relationship. It derives its form of action from the widespread belief that goodness will be eventually rewarded. It is a game most often played out at Christmas time but believed to be operable at all times. The game at Christmas time starts with the question, "Have you been a good child this year?" A "yes" answer brings promises of fulfilled wishes and dreams.

It is easy to extend this thinking into a year-around philosophy for living. Individuals conclude, "If I can't take what I want, I can get it by pleasing other people. I will be as good as they want me to be and I will spend my efforts in trying to please them." The assumption becomes, "If I agree with the other person, be what he expects me to be and throw in bits of praise, then he will reward me. Analyze the following conversation. Mary, known for her kindness and consideration, is performing her act.

John: How was the tennis game today?

Mary: It was O.K. I managed to win.

John: You mean you beat the old Pro? I am surprised.

Mary: Well I suppose I should have said that he let me win. I am really not the winner type.

John: Sorry to hear that. We need some good women athletes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mary: Don't get me wrong. I'm better than you might think. Maybe you could coach me. I've always admired your do or die spirit.

John: I'd like to help you but I'm all tied up in helping my son.

Mary: There's nothing more important than being a good father. I didn't mean to impose on you.

John: You never impose on anyone.

Mary: Thank you. I try not to.

Mary is deceitfully interesting. Her attempts to please are enticing and supporting. But no one will really knows who Mary is or what she really wants. Because she lives by the expectations of others, she is never willing to share herself or directly ask for something. She is more like a shadow who dances to the tunes of her friends. She is very much afraid of intimacy. Attempts to draw Mary out are usually rebuffed. Only if there is constant reassurance that she has pleased is she likely to continue a relationship.

"Pleasing" relationships can exist, as long as two will play the game. They are possible when the pleaser personality relates to an individual who seems to have an endless ability to reassure. The two personality types are able to continually play the game without really knowing each other.

Aside from specific problems such as we have briefly described, there is an overall problem to be resolved if sufficiency and intimacy are to contribute to the general well-being of mankind. It is the dilemma created of being caught between the set of beliefs and assumptions geared to a life of scarcity and the opportunity to enjoy luxuries available through the productiveness of modern science.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The dilemma is the psychological suffering when an individual lives like a king with the conscience of a peasant or when an individual lives the life of a peasant and foregoes the pleasure because his conscience tells him it is the right thing to do. The dilemma is that an individual can't win with either choice.

Individuals who sacrifice personal pleasures suffer in two different ways. First, they build resentment against others who live self-serving lives and, second, they become bitter and resentful when the contract of the Golden Rule under which they live their lives is not kept by the other person. The woman behind the successful man is most likely to be a victim of this type of suffering. When, after years of hard work, such as putting her husband through medical school, she is abandoned, there is almost uncontrollable anger and resentment.

On the other side of the coin are individuals who have the will to indulge and do indulge. After such indulgence, many of them are plagued with guilt and/or disappointment. Some conclude the price of pleasure was too high. Others explain that the new life really couldn't produce the promised rewards. Neither type is emotionally mature enough to enjoy the new life.

Examples can easily be found in the experimenting with sexual intimacy. Specifically, opportunities for sexual intimacy are equated with the capacity to enjoy such intimacies. When the woman accepts the pill as a contraceptive, she may believe she is now ready to enjoy sex in a free and enlightened manner. Such is not always the case. Judith M. Bardwick's study represents various reports that the use of the pill does not erase psychological hangups. This is what she says: "Our subjects' responses to the pill became comprehensible

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

within the total ecology of their lives. Thus the pill, which presumably liberates women to enjoy sex, has instead replaced o ? fear (of pregnancy) with another (of being used). We found that far from giving young women the sexual license that mer ' ve so enjoyed, the pill has caused some to resent the male's freedom even more. Far from alleviating anxiety over the sexual use of the body, the pill has in some ways exacerbated it.

"This anxiety over sex comes from ambivalence toward the body; emotional vulnerability in sexual relationships; difficulty in reaching high-leval arousal and orgasm; and the residues of an older morality. We are still far from a whole new era of sexuality."

The resolution of the problems and dilemmas discussed above are the topic of another paper. However, we will conclude with some generalized remarks related to the resolution of these problems.

The good life especially requires a re-evaluation of how we deal with our intangible needs--such needs as love, affection, companionship, influence, respect and daydreaming. It should come as no great surprise that they must be considered separately from the tangibles of life. It is easy to admit they are not to be bought and sold, bargained for, or treated as scarce commodities. And yet we deal with them as if they are in short supply and we bargain for them as if they were packaged and to be delivered like a loaf of bread.

The following conversations illustrate how love and respect can be treated as commodities to be traded in the market place. A father says to his son, "I don't know how you can expect me to love you when you behave like you do. Show me you are a responsible person and then I can respect and love you."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This mother is making her relationship with her son a bargaining relationship. Her child angrily announces, "I don't love you." She responds, "I don't love you either. Until you love me, I won't love you."

Our beliefs and assumptions about our feelings are a by-product of our historical tradition. Love and similar necessities of life were, in a way, drawn into the scarcity problem--without good reason. There has never been a time when man couldn't generate sufficient love to satisfy every need. It is unusually stupid for us to continue to act as if there might not be enough to go around.

A significant part of the new life style is the satisfaction of giving and sharing without expecting something in return. When you give, you are not beholden, in your own eyes or those of others. The act of giving is not interpreted as a symbol of superiority, power, greatness, benevolence or similar virtues. If the recipient of a gift doesn't respond by being thankful and grateful, you are not disappointed. You aren't resentful if there isn't some gesture to pay back the so-called generosity. You will be prompted to give because it deepens and intensifies your relationships with people.

A most notable dimension of the good life is a lessening concern for Doing and a heightened awareness of Being. Rossylin described her change in this manner: "For years I felt anxious if I had time on my hands. Sometimes I would remember the saying, 'Idleness is the Devil's workshop.' Then I would find something to do and would immediately feel better."

"Last year my pauses became longer. I justified them because I told myself I needed a pickup if I were to get through the day. I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

dawdled over a cup of coffee for twenty minutes or more. I started tasting the coffee instead of gulping it. I noticed the birds, I listened to the radio.

"To make a long story short, I learned what it means to be a Human Being. I now know I exist for other reasons than keeping house, cooking meals, writing checks, driving cars. I now enjoy music and reading; I like to have my back rubbed. I laugh. I even counted my ribs one day without wondering why."

A sense of Being also promotes a new view of family, friends and neighbors. You stop seeing them in terms of success or failure, the money they earn or how neat their yard might be. You no longer treat people like objects to be used or exploited. Women lose their identities as sex objects or hausfraus. Men are no longer judged as go-getters, handsome, useful or studs.

Relationships developed in terms of Being also calls for a different concept of love. This characterization of love is different from the traditional one. Love in the past has been identified with a doing, possessing style. A loving husband has been identified as a man who is considerate of his wife--someone who is loyal, dependable, and steady, fair in his judgment and mind. His possessiveness and jealousy, if not extreme, have been interpreted as love. Similarly the loving wife has been a hard-working wife. She provided her man with a comfortable home and healthy meals, protected him from unnecessary annoyance and aggravation (he had a hard day at the office), and was frugal in the use of his money. She forgave him when he strayed; she was a loving woman. A loving family was characterized as putting each other first.

The love associated with developing abundancy begins with romantic love (a relatively new dimension in human relationships). You can discover

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that romantic love is not only a joyful goal, it is also a prelude to and a pleasurable part of the more mature type of love. The blind acceptance of someone else (made possible by romantic love) develops into a realistic acceptance of the other person as a human being. The ultimate can be expressed this way: "I love you without conditions. I accept you as a person, all of you. I no longer see you as a conglomeration of virtues, faults to be judged and analyzed. Because I love you, I cannot deny or reject any part of your being."

Complementing and supporting acceptance of the other person is the human capacity to understand. The term understanding connotes a variety of meanings common to a love relationship. It indicates discernment, reasonableness, familiarity and comprehension. In an understanding relationship there are overtones of friendliness, harmony, adjustment and mutual agreement. These attributes provide something beyond the factor of acceptance. They imply positive involvement.

When you say, "I understand you," the person to whom you speak can find satisfaction that he is not so complex, unique, or unreasonable that he will have to live a life of loneliness. He is also encouraged to present or develop other aspects of his personality. The reactions become cyclical--the processes of understanding and revealing are enhanced by each other.

Another dimension of the love you can develop is the esteem you have for someone else. Esteem embraces approval and adds an even more positive reaction. It means "to value or prize, especially for real or intrinsic worth; it commonly implies some warmth of feeling or attachment."

The crucial concern of a person seeking love through esteem is his real self. His Being must be esteemed, rather than his ability to please

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

others. A person who is esteemed because he represents someone else's wishes is not likely to interpret such esteem as love. For example, Fred correctly interpreted his parent's pride over his scholarship award. "The award is theirs, not mine. I did it for their sake. They say they love me for it, but I honestly can't feel it is love. I wonder how they would feel if I refused to be an extension of their desires. Until I know they can enjoy and appreciate my successes, I really won't know if they love me."

Acceptance, understanding, and esteem encourage sharing. Sharing is the fourth aspect of a loving relationship. It is the tangible and experiential dimension of love. If love can be identified and measured, it is through acts of sharing. A total sharing of feelings can be equated with total love. Limited sharing indicates limited love.

The philosophy of this type of love discourages the tendency of most people to share the pleasant and hide the unpleasant. It is important for you to combat this tendency, especially the habit of hiding unpleasant feelings. The advice, "Don't express anger" is in contradiction to the fact that most people can't avoid feeling angry toward others. Suppression of anger limits the practice of sharing and prevents the development of a loving relationship.

This point of view is strange and sometimes threatening. It may need considerable effort to understand. One approach is to ask yourself why you are afraid to express anger, resentment or hostility. The answer will probably reveal fear of the consequences--for example, "If I tell him I hate him, he won't love me."

To show negative feelings implies the belief you are really loved by the other person and needn't fear the consequences. To withhold a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

feeling implies the lack of love. Sharing negative feelings and behavior is part of a loving relationship. The sharing is also therapeutic inasmuch as the act is healthy and a reasonable manner rid yourself of these feelings.

Sharing does not develop as a result of resolve. It is intricately interwoven with acceptance, understanding and esteem. However, if any one of these four factors is to be considered the end result, it is sharing. In this sense it becomes an ultimate. When we strive to become Human Beings, the Human quality involved in this concept is the quality of sharing. We can compliment a friend by calling him a Sharing Being as well as a Human Being.

Not all the feelings of the new life-style involve other individuals. They are feelings we can contemplate and relish in the isolation of a private room or in the middle of the desert as well as in the presence of others. They are feelings which block loneliness. Experiencing them provides you with the assurance you are real, important, significant and alive without someone else telling you how great and lovable you are. Two such feelings are joy and contentment. Both are emotional experiences directly related to conditions of sufficiency and abundance.

Joy, according to Dr. Roderic Gorney's book The Human Agenda, is a relatively late arrival in the developing chain of human emotions. He identifies two distinct kinds of joy. The first kind grows out of personal freedom. As soon as we are granted or insist upon our rights to decide what we want, what we do and how we think, we open the door to joyful experiences. The pleasurable awareness of self-determination is a significant feature of the joyful moment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The satisfaction of deciding what we want complements the satisfaction of fulfilling our needs. There is joy in savoring a delicious meal. There is gratification in sexual intimacy. Slaking one's thirst on a hot day is joyful.

The decision to partake and the partaking are two parts of a joy-producing cycle. The decision to partake in itself makes life enjoyable. The partaking provides energy and positive motivation for new decisions and activities. When the cycle provides maximum or near-maximum rewards, we become energetic and creative human beings.

A different kind of joy is more closely tied to sufficiency. It is a feeling which in no manner relates to survival or accomplishment. It is an exhilarated awareness of being without regard for utilitarian purpose. This joy stems from physical and mental activities which, under circumstances of need, seem foolish and frivolous. Because they contribute nothing to the traditional welfare of man, they are often branded as wasteful..

It is easier to identify this type of pleasurable activity in pets than in ourselves. We accept pets and guarantee them well-living without measuring their value in terms of creations of material goods--a way of living rarely granted to members of the human race. A most obvious example is the soft kitten joyously pouncing through the house, throwing here and there her favorite play mouse.

Many people doubt that man could be so frivolous, and believe that even if he could be, he should never succumb to such a "weakness." We operate in the assumption that the world can't afford such nonsense. Any and all behavior should be devoted to productive activities. We don't even have time to daydream.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We should be, and increasingly are, experiencing this kind of joy. During a group discussion Rita enjoyed telling about her pastimes. "I like to sneak back into bed after my husband and children leave. It's like you said, a habit without rhyme or reason. But it feels cozy; I enjoy the touch of soft bed sheets (more luxury), and the smell of my husband on the pillow. If I listened to my conscience, I could convince myself that I am a wicked, indolent woman, but I don't."

Contentment is presented last because it is furthest removed from the feeling of pain--a feeling so very prevalent in the history of mankind. It is also devoid of frustration, anxiety and desperation--also feelings common to the toil-and-struggle pattern of existence.

Contentment reflects a sense of accomplishment and completeness. Whenever we declare a project or activity completed, we are in a position to experience contentment. It is a feeling which emerges when we say to ourselves, "Well done, the job is finished."

Such a statement is closely associated with a number of judgments and attitudes. There is awareness of personal decisions and a responsibility in the creation of an end result. Your ideas, your judgments are a part of it. At the same time there is an awareness that the objective accomplished now stands as an entity by itself. A most significant attitude is the realization that you are free to create something else. You realize you are the master of the situation and not constantly bound to an endless task from which there is no reprieve.

Contentment provides reassurance that life need not be monotonous. Each decision that an undertaking is as complete as circumstances allow frees you to start over. Even if you decide to repeat a project, it will

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

differ because of previous experience. What was learned in the old can be incorporated in the new. Mistakes can be modified or eliminated. Contentment allows each of us to free himself from the past, enjoy the present and anticipate the future.